

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 21 2006

Application No. 09/911,435

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Enclosed is a set of substitute drawings.

FIG. 1 has been amended to label the item identified by reference numeral 66 to "Desirable Text Link Listing" instead of "Desirable Text Listing." FIG. 1 has also been amended to label the reference numeral 72 as "Next Link Listing" instead of "Next Term Listing."

FIG. 3 has been amended to add the item "Capture Source Version of the Web Page" between the items "Get Responsive Page" and "Distill to get Listing of URLs & Text Links." Applicant notes that no new matter is added by this amendment, as the specification discloses capturing the source version of a web page. (See instant application: page 12, paragraph 1)

FIG. 4 has been amended to add the items: "Determine Validation Queries", "Submit First Validation Query Twice", "Submit Remaining Validation Queries", "Store Validation Query Results", "Store URL Results", and "Search For Next Link." (See instant Application: page 15, paragraph 3 to page 16 paragraph 5).

FIG. 5 has been added, showing the numerical metrics disclosed in the specification. (See instant Application: page 13, paragraph 2).

No new matter has been added as the material added is present in the Application and/or claims as originally filed.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 21 2006

Application No. 09/911,435

REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are pending. By this Amendment, no claims are cancelled, claims 1, 4, 19, and 35 are amended and no new claims are added. Applicant respectfully points out that the amendment to claim 19 is provided for clarification purposes only, and was not made in response to any objection or rejection presented in the Office Action.

Drawings

The Office Action states: "The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 183(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the limitations of claims 1, 4, 19, 30, 32, 34, and 35 must be shown or the feature(s) cancelled from the claim(s)." Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the drawings, as currently presented, show every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

Regarding claims 1, 4, 19, and 35:

Claims 1, 4 and 19 as currently presented similarly recite in part: "obtaining a database listing containing the uniform resource locators (URLs) for each one of a plurality of databases to be configured." Figure 1, reference number 62, shows a "database listing". The instant specification provides with respect to reference 62: "The database listing 62 provides a plurality of URLs, each associated with one of the database to be analyzed." (See instant application: page 9, paragraph 4). Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that Figure 1 shows this feature recited in claims 1, 4, and 19.

Claims 1, 4 and 19 as currently presented similarly recite in part: "accessing each one of said plurality of database." Claim 35 recites in part: "accessing a web page from a web site providing access to a database." Applicant respectfully asserts that Figure 1, reference number

Application No. 09/911,435

42 of the instant Application shows accessing each one of a plurality of databases. "The action string module 42 is interfaced with the computer system 20 for determining a format associated with an entry page for a database 4. The action string module 42 is used for determining an appropriate data entry window for use in passing a query to the database 4." (See instant Application: page 8, paragraph 5). Applicant respectfully asserts that in order for the action string module 42 to "determine an appropriate data entry window" from the plurality of databases 4, it necessarily must access the plurality of databases. Also, the action string module must necessarily access a web page from a website providing access to a database. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that these claim elements are disclosed in Figure 1.

Claim 1 as currently presented recites in part: "capturing a web page from each database of the plurality of databases associated with said URL." Claims 4 and 19 as currently presented similarly recite in part: "capturing a web page from the database associated with said URL." Claim 35 recites in part: "capturing said web page." Applicant respectfully asserts that Figure 3 of the instant application, which describes the action string module 42 discussed above, shows these claim elements. Figure 3 shows "Distill to get Listing of URLs & Text Links." Applicant respectfully asserts that this is equivalent to capturing a web page. This is also equivalent to accessing a web page from a web site providing access to a database. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that this claim element is disclosed in Figure 3.

Claims 1, 3, and 19 as currently presented similarly recite in part: "locating data entry windows in said captured web page." Claim 35 recites in part: "locating at least one data entry window in said captured web page." Both Figure 1 and Figure 3 disclose these claim elements. With respect to Figure 1, reference 42, the Application discloses: "The action string module 42 is used for determining an appropriate data entry window for use in passing a query to the database 4." (See instant Application: page 8, paragraph 5). In addition, Figure 3 discloses the following steps: "Distill to get Listing of URLs & Text Links"; "Ignore all Links"; "Find Forms (actually

Application No. 09/911,435

tagged with label "Form". The Application discloses: "Each of the forms is scored to determine the most likely candidate for a data entry window for submitting a user's query to be searched, by the database or website." (See instant Application: page 12, paragraph 1). These steps disclosed in Figure 3 are therefore make up the step of "locating data entry windows in said captured webpage" as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that both Figures 1 and 3 each adequately disclose these claim elements.

Claim 1 as currently presented recites in part: "selecting a most probable data entry window of data entry windows for passing queries to said at least one database." Claims 4 and 19 as currently presented similarly recite in part: "selecting a most probable data entry window of data entry windows for passing queries to said database." Claim 35 recites in part: "determining a most probable data entry window of said at least one data entry window for passing queries to said database." Applicant respectfully asserts that Figure 3 shows these claim elements. Figure 3 shows: "Score All Forms"; and "Highest Score is Picked." The specification discloses: "Each of the forms is scored to determine the most likely candidate for a data entry window for submitting a user's query to be searched, by the database or website. The form with the highest score is then selected as the data entry window for user's queries." (See instant Application: page 12, paragraph 1). Applicant respectfully asserts that Figure 3 clearly shows selecting or determining a most probable data entry window as similarly recited in claims 1, 4, 19, and 35.

Claims 1, 4, and 19 as currently presented similarly recite in part: "searching candidate responses for a next link indicating a next page for additional results from said at least one database in response to a query." Figure 1 discloses this claim element at reference number 72 and 46. With respect to reference number 72, the specification states: "the next link listing 72 provides the next link module 46 with a plurality of candidate terms for facilitating selection of a URL associated with a link to additional responses provided by the database 4 in response to the

Application No. 09/911,435

user's query." Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that reference numbers 72 and 46 disclose searching candidate responses for a next link indicating a next page for additional results.

Claims 1, 4, and 19 as currently presented similarly recite in part: "writing an engine file describing the form layout and requirements based upon said candidate responses and said next link." Claim 35 recites in part: "storing an identification of said most probable data entry window in association with an identification of said database for use in submitting queries to said database. Applicant respectfully asserts that these claim elements are disclosed in Figure 1, reference number 48. "The engine file module [48] is also interfaced to the computer system 20 and every other module 42, 44, 46 for storing results produced by each module 42, 44, 46 such that a general format query is translatable into a database specific dialect (format) allowing a common query to be submitted to multiple database 4 each requiring different formats." (See instant Application: page 9, paragraph 3). Applicant respectfully asserts that the engine file is shown in the drawings as being an element capable of storing results and that one of those stored results is the form layout and requirements based upon candidate responses and the next link. Further, with respect to claim 35, the engine file stores an identification of a most probably data entry window associated with an identification of a database. Therefore, Applicant asserts that these claim elements are shown in the drawings.

For at least those reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully traverses the objection to claims 1, 4, 19, and 35. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the objection to claims 1, 4, 19, and 35.

Regarding claim 4:

Claim 4 recites in part: "wherein the step of locating data entry windows and the step of selecting a most probably data entry window of data entry windows in said captured web page

Application No. 09/911,435

further comprises." As stated above, Applicant respectfully asserts that locating data entry windows is certainly shown by the existing figures.

Claim 4 recites in part: "saving information captured from the web page as a source version of the web page." Applicant respectfully asserts that Figure 3, as currently presented, discloses: "capture a source version of the webpage." Applicant respectfully asserts that capturing a source version is equivalent to saving a source version as recited in claim 4. Therefore, this claim element is shown in the figures.

Claim 4 recites in part: "Filtering said source version into additional listings of URLs and text portions." Applicant respectfully asserts that Figure 3 shows this claim element. Figure 3 shows "Distill to get Listing of URLs & Text Links." Applicant respectfully asserts that this is equivalent to "Filtering said source version into additional listings of URLs and text portions." Therefore, this claim element is shown in the figures.

Claim 4 recites in part: "examining said text portions for occurrences of a form label; collecting each form tagged with the form label." Figure 3 shows: "Find Forms (actually tagged with label "Form")." Applicant respectfully asserts that this is equivalent to examining said text portions for occurrences of a form label and collecting those forms. Therefore, this claim element is shown in the figures.

Claim 4 recites in part: "scoring each one of said forms to develop a numerical representation of a likelihood that any one form is a query input form." Figure 3 shows: "Score All Forms." Applicant respectfully asserts that score all forms is equivalent to this claim element. Therefore, this claim element is shown in the figures.

Claim 4 recites in part: "selecting one of said forms based on said form having a higher numerical representation than any other of said forms." Figure 3 shows: "Highest Score is Picked." Applicant respectfully asserts that picking the highest score is identical to selecting the

Application No. 09/911,435

form that has a higher numerical representation. Therefore, this claim element is shown in the figures.

Claim 4 recites in part: "storing an action string associated with said form, said action string comprising a URL having at least a domain portion, a program portion, and a query portion; storing a get-post indicator associated with said database." Figure 3 shows "Store Action String and Type (Get or Post)". Applicant respectfully asserts that storing an action string is shown in figure 3. Further, storing a type, such as get or post, is also included. Therefore, this claim element is shown in the figures.

Claim 4 recites in part: "wherein the step of scoring each one of the forms further comprises: "locating an action string associated with said data entry window; obtaining a listing of bad action string; comparing said action string with said listing of bad action strings and determining if a portion of said action string matches any bad action strings of said listing of bad action strings, setting said numerical representation to zero and terminating said step of scoring if a portion of said action string matches any of said bad action strings within a predefined window determined by a binding factor." Applicant respectfully asserts that Figure 1 shows this claim element. Figure 1 discloses, at 64, a "Bad Action String Listing". With respect to the Bad Action String Listing, the Application discloses: "The bad action string listing 64 provides URLs for known database (search engines) 4 which are not to be included in the analysis of said database 4." (See instant application: page 9, paragraph 6). Applicant respectfully asserts that index 64 does disclose this claim element; because index 64 discloses not including in analysis of a database action strings on the bad action list. This necessarily includes a comparison of action strings with those on the bad action string list, and disregarding those that are found on the list as recited in claim 4. Therefore, this claim element is shown in the figures.

Claim 4 recites in part: "setting a name matching metric; setting an undesirable link test metric; setting an undesirable value metric; setting a desirable link text metric; setting a null text

Application No. 09/911,435

metric; computing a said numerical representation.” Newly added Figure 5 clearly discloses all the numerical metrics recited in claim 4. Applicant respectfully asserts that the addition of Figure 5, as is consistent with the requirement set out under 37 CFR 1.83(a), that no new matter has been added in creating Figure 5. Applicant respectfully asserts that the subject matter of Figure 5 is included in the application as filed. (See instant application: Page 13, Paragraph 2).

For at least those reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully traverses the objection to claim 4. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the objection to claim 4.

Regarding claim 19:

Applicant respectfully asserts that Figure 4 as amended shows all elements of claim 19. Claim 19, as currently presented, recites in part: “determining a location of each one of a plurality of results or non-result item locations, comprising:” Applicant respectfully asserts that Figure 4, as currently presented, shows the steps comprising determining locations. Figure 4 has been amended to include: “determine validation queries”, “submit first validation query twice”, “submit remaining validation queries”, and “store validation query results” steps prior to correlating the URL’s as discussed in Figure 4. Further, Figure 4 has been amended to add “store URL results” and “search for next link.” Applicant respectfully asserts that Figure 4, as currently amended, shows all elements of claim 19.

Regarding claims 30, 32, and 34:

Claims 30, 32, and 34 as currently presented recite in part: “a computer system having a storage means for facilitating the retention and recall of dynamic database content, said computer system having a communications means for performing bi-directional communications between said computer system and a network.” Applicant respectfully asserts that Figure 1 clearly

Application No. 09/911,435

discloses a computer system 20, including storage means 22, and communication means 24. Further, the specification supports this interpretation of Figure 1. "The computer system 20 includes a storage means 22 for facilitating the retention and recall of dynamic database content. The computer system 20 also includes a communication means 24 for performing bi-directional communications between the computer system 20 and the network." (See instant Application: page 7, paragraph 8).

Claims 30, 32, and 34 as currently presented recite in part: "a query input means for receiving a plurality of queries from a user and transferring the plurality of queries to a plurality of databases." Applicant respectfully asserts that Figure 1 clearly discloses a query input means 26 as recited in the objected to claims. Further, the specification provides: "The query input means 26 is for transferring the plurality of queries to a plurality of databases 4." (See instant Application: page 8, paragraph 2).

Claims 30, 32, and 34 as currently presented recite in part: "an action string module interfaced to said computer system and configured to automatically determine a format associated with an entry page for a database from said entry page, said action string module being configured to automatically determine an appropriate data entry window on said entry page for use in passing a query to said database." Figure 1 clearly shows an action string module 42. Further, the specification provides: "The action string module 42 is interfaced with the computer system 20 for determining a format associated with an entry page for a database 4. The action string module 42 is used for determining an appropriate data entry window for use in passing query to the database 4." (See instant Application: page 8, paragraph 5).

Claims 30, 32, and 34 as currently presented recite in part: "a results module interfaced to said computer system and said action string module, said results module locating areas on a responsive page returned by said database in response to said query where results are placed." Figure 1 clearly shows a results module 44. Further, the specification provides: "The results

Application No. 09/911,435

module 44 is also interfaced with the computer system 20 and the action string module 42. The results module 44 locates areas on a responsive page returned by the database 4 in response to the submitted query where results are placed." (See instant Application: page 8, paragraph 6).

Claims 30, 32, and 34 as currently presented recite in part: "a next link module interface to each one of said computer system, action string module, and results module, said next link module locating a link associated with additional results provided by said database in response to said query." Figure 1 clearly shows a next link module 46. Further, the specification provides: "Similarly, the next link module 46 is interfaced to the computer system 20, action string module 42, and results module 44. The next link module 46 locates a URL for a link associated with additional results provided by the database 4 in response to the query." (See instant application: page 9, paragraph 2).

Claims 30, 32, and 34 as currently presented recite in part: "an engine file module interfaced to said computer system and said modules for storing results produced by each module such that a general format query is translatable into a database specific format allowing a common query to be submitted to multiple databases each requiring different formats." Figure 1 clearly shows an engine file module 48. Further, the specification provides: "The engine file module 48 is also interfaced to the computer system 20 and every other module 42, 44, 46 for storing results produced by each module 42, 44, 46 such that a general format query is translatable into a database specific dialect (format) allowing a common query to be submitted to multiple database 4 each requiring different formats.

For at least those reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of claims 30, 32, and 34.

Application No. 09/911,435

Regarding claims 32 and 34:

Claims 32 and 34 similarly recite in part: "a data comparison portion providing user specific information to each of said modules for facilitating analysis of said databases; wherein said data comparison portion further comprises." Figure 1 clearly shows a data comparison portion 60. Further, the specification provides: "A data comparison portion 60 provides user specific information to each of the modules... for facilitating analysis of the database 4." (See instant Application: page 9, paragraph 4).

Claims 32 and 34 similarly recite in part: "a database listing providing a URL for each of said databases to be analyzed." Figure 1 clearly shows a database listing 62. Further, the specification provides "The database listing 62 provides a plurality of URL's, each associated with one of the databases 4 to be analyzed." (See instant Application: page 9, paragraph 5).

Claims 32 and 34 similarly recite in part: "a bad action string listing providing URLs for known databases which are not to be included in the analysis of said databases." Figure 1 clearly shows a bad action string listing 64. Further, the specification provides "The bad action string listing 64 provides URLs for known databases (search engines) 4 which are not to be included in the analysis of said databases 4." (See instant Application: page 9, paragraph 6).

Claims 32 and 34 similarly recite in part: "a desirable text link listing providing a plurality of desirable terms for use in analysis of said databases, a presence of any one of said plurality of desirable terms increasing a score associated with a data entry window on one of said responsive pages." Figure 1 clearly shows a desirable text link listing 66. Further, the specification provides "The desirable text link listing 66 provides a plurality of desirable terms for use in analysis of the database 4." (See instant Application: page 9, paragraph 7).

Claims 32 and 34 similarly recite in part: "an undesirable text link listing providing a plurality of undesirable terms for use in analysis of said databases, a presence of any one of said plurality of undesirable terms setting a score associated with a data entry window on one of said

Application No. 09/911,435

responsive pages to 0 and ending analysis of said data entry window." Figure 1 clearly shows an undesirable text link listing 68. Further, the specification provides "The undesirable text link listing 68 provides a plurality of undesirable terms for use in analysis of the database 4. The presence of any one of the plurality of undesirable terms sets a score associated with a data entry window (form) on one of the responsive pages to 0 and ends the analysis of the data entry window." (See instant Application: page 10, paragraph 2).

Claims 32 and 34 similarly recite in part: "an undesirable value listing providing a plurality of undesirable values for use in analysis of said databases, a presence of any one of said plurality of undesirable values decreases a score associated with a data entry window on one of said responsive pages." Figure 1 clearly shows an undesirable value listing 70. Further, the specification provides "The undesirable value listing 70 provides a plurality of undesirable values for use in analysis of the databases 4. The presence of any one of the plurality of undesirable values decreases a score associated with a data entry window (form) on one of the responsive pages." (See instant Application: page 10, paragraph 3).

Regarding claim 34:

Claim 34 recites in part: "a next link listing providing said next link module with a plurality of candidate terms for facilitating selection of a URL associated with a link to additional responses provided by said database in response to said query." Figure 1, as currently presented, clearly shows a next link listing 72. Further, the specification provides: "The next link listing 72 provides the next link module 46 with a plurality of candidate terms for facilitating selection of a URL associated with a link to additional responses provided by the database 4 in response to the user's query." (See instant Application: page 10, paragraph 4).

Application No. 09/911,435

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-3, 17, 18, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses.

First, Applicant respectfully notes that in the Office Action Summary included in this Office Action, claims 1-3, 18, 30, 31, 33, and 35-44 are rejected. However, Applicant cannot find in the Office Action any mention of a basis for rejection of claims 30, 31, or 33. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests clarification of the basis for the rejection of these claims.

Regarding Claim 1:

In support of the rejection of claim 1, the Office Action states: "Claim 1 recites the limitation 'said database' in line 9. There insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 1, line 3, recites a database listing which is not a database and claim 1, line 5 recites a plurality of databases. It is unclear to the Examiner as to which database the queries of the data entry window being passed to." Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1, as currently presented, recites in part: "capturing at least one webpage from at least one database of the plurality of databases associated with said URL", and "selecting a most probable data entry window of data entry windows for passing queries to said at least one database" and "searching candidate responses for a next link indicating a next page for additional results from said at least one database in response to a query." Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 as currently presented does provide sufficient antecedent basis. Further, Applicant respectfully asserts that it is clear which database the queries of the data entry window are being passed to. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claims 1-3.

Application No. 09/911,435

Regarding claim 35:

In support of the rejection of claim 35, the Office Action states: "Claim 35 recites the limitation "a database" in line 2 and also "a database in line 3. It is unclear whether or not a database in line 2 is different from a database in line 3." Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 35, as currently presented, recites in part: "accessing a web page from a web site providing access to the database." Applicant respectfully asserts that only a single database is referenced in claim 35.

In further support of the rejection of claim 35, the Office Actions states: "Claim 35 recites the limitation "an identification" in line 8 and also "an identification" in line 9. It is unclear whether or not an identification in line 8 is different from an identification in line 9." Applicant respectfully disagrees with the basis for this rejection. Applicant agrees that there are two recitations of "an identification". However, the claim recites: "an identification of said most probably data entry window", and "an identification of said database." Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 35 clearly presents two distinct identifications.

For at least those reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claim 35.

The Office Action further states: "Claims 2, 3, 17, 18, 36-42, 43, and 44 are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their respective base claims by dependency." As stated above, Applicant asserts that claims 1 and 35 are in condition for allowance. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claims 2, 3, 17, 18, 36-42, 43, and 44.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Application No. 09/911,435

Please note that this paper, and all other filed contemporaneously with it, are filed pursuant to representative capacity as specified in 37 CFR § 1/34, pending formal substitution of attorneys, which shall occur at the earliest opportunity with every intent to avoid delays in prosecution on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,



Brad Pedersen

Registration No. 32,432

Customer No. 24113

Patterson, Thunte, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.

4800 IDS Center

80 South 8th Street

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100

Telephone: (612) 349-5774